Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/807,941	RUDY, YORAM
	Examiner	Art Unit
•	George R. Evanisko	3762
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>George R. Evanisko</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Gary Pitzer</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 9 July 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicat Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	·
Part I.	•	
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		٠.
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview.
•		
•		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant)	Applicant's Representative Signature	nature – if appropriate)
, typhodile	- IPPROGRES FROM COCHICE OF	ghataro ii appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr Pitzer stated that the non-final action was mailed to the wrong address and that they did not receive the action till it was printed off of Palm on 7/9/07. Since the non-final action was mailed to the wrong address, the shortened statutory period will begin from the mailing date of this letter..